REMARKS

The above identified Office Action has been reviewed, the applied reference carefully reconsidered, and the Examiner's comments carefully weighed. In this regard base Claim 19 has been amended.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to discuss the merits during a telephonic interview on May 8, 2006, in which it was agreed that a recitation was needed to structurally define the "correspendence" feature being claimed.

It is contended that by the present Amendment, all bases of rejection set forth in the Office Action have been traversed and overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Grounds for Rejection:

According to the Office Action, Claims 19-25 are rejected as being anticipated by Ornstein '431.

In view of the present amendment to base Claim 19, Applicant respectfully traverses the aforesaid ground for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for the reasons set forth in detail below.

The test to be applied for purposes of determining the propriety of a rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 is set forth in <u>RCA Corporation v. Digital Data Systems</u>, Inc., 221 U.S.P.Q. 385, 388 (C.A.F.C. 1984), where the Court held:

"Anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under principles of inherency, each and every claimed element of the claimed invention."

Applicant's amended base Claim 19 requires, inter alia:

"... a Craps table lay-out having a periphery, said Craps table lay-out comprising a pass line bet area, a point numbers area and a proposition bet area located at a central portion of said Craps table lay-out; said Craps table lay-out further comprising:

a plurality of mutually spaced player betting areas, each player betting area of said plurality of player betting areas comprising a player betting area indicia, said player betting area indicia comprising a predetermined symbolic identifier uniquely identified for the proposition bet, said plurality of player betting areas being located between generally said pass line bet area and said periphery of said Craps table layout, each player betting area of said plurality of player betting areas being respectively located at a player play position of said Craps table lay-out; and

a plurality of wager areas, each wager area of said plurality of wager areas comprising a wager area indicia, said wager area indicia comprising said predetermined symbolic identifier of said plurality of player betting areas uniquely identified for the proposition bet, said plurality of wager areas being all located adjacent said proposition bet area."

Applicant's Response:

Applicant has now provided a structural interrelationship between the player betting areas and the wager areas in that the respective indicia must comprise an identical predetermined symbolic identifier, which recitation is completely absent from Ornstein '431.

Therefore, in view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks,

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 as
regards amended base Claim 19, and, under the principle that dependent claims merely further
define their respective base claims, that the rejection be withdrawn as regards Claims 20-25.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter this Amendment, allow the claims, and pass this Application on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter D. Keefe

Reg. No. 31,114

Dated: May 15, 2006

Peter D. Keefe Keefe and Associates 24405 Gratiot Ave. Eastpointe, MI 48021

Tel. (586) 775-5680 Fax (586) 775-2769

e-mail: PDK@PatentApplication.com